G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1897-98

~~191~~

(Genl. Finl.)

File No. 17

Serial Nos. 1—9

Later references

P hh E-K

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—9

Major **Part B for** October 1898

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the order of the Dy: Commr Tumkur fining Huttappa & others for unauthorised cultivation of a portion of S. Nos. 39 & 55 resigned by them.

Sl: 9. 2836 dt 11. 10. 98

To, Lingappa, Yalladahadlu village, Tumkur Tq

Informs him that the Dy Commr of the Tumkur Dist: has been instructed to remit the fine imposed on him

Countersigned

Dy

Indexed.
L. Seenivasa Rao

W D 58—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

2- The Shekdar also submitted the depositions of Huchappa, Linsappa and Shanbhog Shamanna and also a Kabulayat to the following Effect:-

Phod No. 1 of Survey No. 39 in the Khata of Huchappa is waste. Phod No. 2 measuring 7 a 3 g - 18 and bearing an assessment of Rs. 5-8 is sown with Ragi &c. by Huchappa.

Phod No. 1 of Survey No. 55 is waste. Phod No. 2 measuring 6 a 3 g - 10 and bearing an assessment of Rs. 3 is sown with Ragi &c. by Linsappa.

On Examination they stated that they had retained the phod nos. which had been cultivated by them and resigned those which were lying waste and unfit for cultivation.

Both of them have cultivated the lands shewn in the accounts as pot. waste.

3 On 20-1-98 the Amildar Examined Huchappa, Linsappa and Shanbhog Shamanna.

Huchappa stated:-

I had the whole of Survey No. 39 in my Khata I got it phoded and retained the portion I have now cultivated by resigning the portion which I did not like to have. I have been cultivating the portion, which I liked to have for the last 8 years. In the accounts the land I have been cultivating is shewn as waste. It might be the fault of the person who wrote Kaznama for me. It is the Shanbhog who wrote the Kaznama. I

have been paying an assessment of Rs. 5/8. for the land in my cultivation - about 9 years have Elapsed since I got the land in my Khata phoded - I have been cultivating the phod no I proposed above - I now understand that the no. I assessed now under my cultivation is shown in the accounts as waste and that the no. which I wanted to relinquish is registered in my Khata I have cultivated the waste land taken up to post - I have been doing this for the last 8 or 9 years - after the receipt of Sanction for phod I showed the Razinama in proper season (Before Sd ee) - Retaining the no. shown as waste I Signified my intention to the Chaubhoy and requested him to have a Razinama written for me for the phod no. Entered in my Khata - the Razinama, which he wrote for me through Shevoji I presented to the office. I cannot adduce Evidence to show that the Chaubhoy has practised Shevoji - Nor is there any other proof for this. The cultivation of the no. Entered in the accounts as post. waste is not my fault - It is the fault of Chaubhoy. I never cultivated the phod in my Khata - I have been cultivating the phod under reference -

(doubtful)

Chaubhoy Chamanna Stated :-

Phod no. 1 of Survey no. 39 measuring 7 a 2 g to and bearing an assessment of Rs. 5/- is in the Khata of Bachappa - Phod no. 2 measuring 7 a 3 g and bearing an assessment of Rs. 5/- is Entered as waste in the

accounts. The above phod no was on the Razinama of Hucha[illegible]appa Entered as waste in the year Vikruti. I did not write Razinama for phod no. 2 when the said Huchappa asked me to have a Razinama written for him for phod no. 1. I wrote Razinama for the phod no. for which I was asked to write a Razinama. It is true that he has been cultivating phod no. 2 from the year Vikruti. I have submitted the Pahani account of the years Durmukhi and Pavilambi. I have noted therein there was crop on phod no. 1 and that phod no. 2 was waste. I have written the same in previous Pahani accounts also. I wrote thus under the impression that the phod no. which was under cultivation was phod no. 1. The mistake was found out during the maintenance of the Shekdar. This is my fault. I should be excused for it.

Shows that the Pahani or inspection is not properly conducted

The Chambhog further stated:-

Linga[illegible]appa of this village applied for and obtained Survey no. 55 measuring 9 acres and bearing an assessment of Rs. 6/8 during the year Nandana. In the year Vijaya it was phoded into two Sub nos. The 1st phod measuring 4a-30 and bearing an assessment of Rs. 3/8 and the 2nd phod measuring 4a-0 and bearing an assessment of Rs. 3/-. In the year Manmata he resigned phod no. 2 and retained phod no. 1 in his Khate. Since then he has been cultivating phod no. 2 - Phod no. 1 has been waste. I have been noting in the Pahanis that phod no 1

9

is under cultivation and plot no. 2 waste. The fault is due to my not seeing the boundary (Block V no. 2). I have committed this mistake through ignorance of the situation of the plot nos. I should be excused.

Linsappa stated :-

I resigned plot no. 2 of survey no. 55 measuring 4a-2g and bearing an assessment of Rs. 3/- in the year mentioned. I have been cultivating the same no. I requested (the Chambhog) that a Razinama might be written for me for plot no. 1. I do not know what no was inserted in it. The same no. which I liked to retain was inserted in the Razinama and the same no. I have been cultivating since then. This is not my fault. It is the mistake of the Chambhog.

4 In the Pahani of the years 1891-92, 1892-93 and 1893-94 plot no. 2 of survey no. 39 is shewn as waste and plot no. 1 as having been cultivated with ragi by Hachappa. In the Khedwar patrika it is stated that according to Razinama no. 200 of 2-4-91 plot no. 2 is entered as waste.

5 The Amildar submitted these proceedings to the 2nd Joint Sub-Judge with the Sahkar Talla during the Jamabandi of 1897-98 and stated that the the same portions which had been resigned had been cultivated - and that the assessment thereof from the year of relinquishment should be recovered from the parties as fine and recommended that the Chambhog

might be warned for his careless in both these cases

6. On 4-4-98 the Dy. Commr. passed the following order:-

Khatedar Linsappa is present. He is a literate man. His plea that his resignation for plot no. 2 of survey no. 55 is meant for plot no. 10 the said no. is not worthy of credit. His cultivation and enjoyment of plot no. 2 since the year Vilambi should be considered as unauthorised cultivation. Double the assessment of the said portion for the three years, viz - Vilambi, Dhurmukhi, and Kevilambi should be recovered from Linsappa.

On the whole recover from Linsappa Rs. 18 as fine, confirm plot no. 2 of survey no. 55 in his Khata, set his resignation for plot no. 1 and Enter it as waste from Vilambi.

Above remark is applicable to Kuchappa also. Double the assessment of plot no. 2 of survey no. 39 for 7 years from the year Khara should be recovered from the Khatedar. Plot no. 2 of survey no. 39 should be confirmed in the Khata of Kuchappa. Set his resignation for plot no. 1 and Enter it as waste from the year Vilambi.

The carelessness of the Chambhog is quite apparent in both these cases. It appears that it is the habit of the Chambhog to Enter without proper Enquiry wrong nos. when he writing out resignations and also to prepare

accounts during Pahani without levying the
taxes. As an Exemplary punishment
he is fined Rs. 15/= the Shanbhog should
be warned that if such confusion (Error)
is brought to my notice again he would be
removed from office

7 Against this order Huchappa and Lingappa
have appealed to Govt.

Huchappa States

About 10 years ago he applied for and
obtained Survey No. 39. After four years
cultivation of the land he found that half
the portion of the land was Kharab and
unfit for cultivation. Whereupon he
got an application written by the Shan-
bhog to the effect that the cultivable portion
of the land might be phoded and given to
him and presented it to the Taluk. The
Shanbhog himself in pursuance of the
order issued from the Taluk phoded
& separated the cultivable portion as
it then. Accordingly he has been
the portion for the last 7 years and pa
its Kandayam.

During the Taluk Jamabandi the
Shekdar found out that the portion of the
land cultivated by him was shown in the
accounts as waste and that the portion re-
linquished by him as under cultivation. After
enquiry the matter was brought on the Taluk
Jalla which was submitted for orders during
the Huzur Jamabandi. On this the Dy. Com.
ordered that the full amount of the Kandayam

the portion amounting to Rs. 80 and odd should be recovered from him as fine.

The grounds urged are :-

He applied that only the portion that was unfit for cultivation might be ploughed - but by a mistake the Chaukidar entered a wrong no. in the Darkhast. The order of the Dy. Collr. attributing this mistake (=0=0=) to the petitioner and fining him Rs. 80/- is not only unjust but also severe -

It is clear from the local investigation as well as from the records that the petitioner is honest and that this affair is the outcome of mistake (=0=0=) - It is unjust that the Dy. Collr. has not taken this into consideration.

The Chaukidar in his deposition clearly admits that this is a mistake - It is clear from the records also that he has not acted with any dishonest motives in having obtained the plough and that he has not committed the offence under reference -

The order of the Dy. Collr. is opposed to principles and the Evidence in the case and also to law -

The portion resigned as well as the portion retained by him bear the same amount of Kandayam - There is no difference in them. It is unjust that the Dy. Collr. has not taken this into consideration

The papers States :-

He applied for and obtained Survey no. 55 for cultivation - 3 years ago - as the major por[illegible] no. was Kharab he applied to the Talati that it might be ploughed and that the portion fit for cultivation -

+ =0=0=

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

might be confirmed to him. Whereupon steps were taken to sub-divide the no. and the portion fit for cultivation was placed in his possession. He has been enjoying it accordingly.

During the Jamabandi of the current year the Shekdar reported that the portion in the enjoyment of the petitioner had been resumed by him and that it was seen from the accounts that the portion resumed had been under cultivation. On this the Amildar reported this matter in the Taluk Panchayat. The Dy. Comr. as Jamabandi officer thereupon passed the order appealed against.

The petitioner has not been enjoying plot no. 1 (2½) with any intention of fraud or causing loss to Govt. Without any fraudulent motive he has been enjoying the portion shewn by the Authority that, those the no. as fit for cultivation. The views of the Dy. Comr. questioning his intention are unjust.

It is unjust that the Dy. Comr. has not considered whether the local investigation and the evidence adduced have disclosed him to be fraudulent.

He, an innocent man, has been pressed liable for the clerical mistake done by the Shanbhog through inadvertence (Rs 8 2 0 0 0 0 0) in the course of the Jamabandi (Rs 0 : 0 2 0 0 0). This is unjust.

The petitioner with a view to retain the portion fit for cultivation obtained the

land in a peculiar course and without any fraudulent motive. Accordingly he has been enjoying the portion. But it was not his intention to retain the portion useful for cultivation.

It is clearly proved both in the local investigation and from the evidence that he is innocent and honest. Moreover it is proved that the Chambhoy's mistake is a clerical mistake

The Dy. Conr. without taking the above facts into consideration has agreed to recover from him the amount of Kandayam

This order is opposed to the records and evidence in the case and also to Law

It is urged that the Dy. Conr. has not taken into consideration the fact that the petitioner has been paying larger amount of Kandayam although the portion of land in his enjoyment bears a small amount of Kandayam

8. The above petitions were sent to the Dy. Conr. for submission of a report and the proceedings of the case. Nos. Pet 1487 & Pet 1488 of 16-6-98

9 The Dy. Conr. on getting the records of the case from the Taluk having found that the Rajinama presented by petitioner Kuchappa was not in the file called upon the Amildar to submit it. No. 238 of 11-8-98

10 The Amildar in reply states that the Rajinama referred to is not forthcoming and that consequently he has submitted No. 319 of 22-8-98

the Kate account of the year Khasra in which phod no. 2 of Survey no. 39 is struck off the Khata of the petitioner -

11. The Vajjinama of 22-6-98 presented by Linkappa is in the file. It is the effect that he has resigned his holding viz- Sub no. 2 of Survey no. 55 -

12 There are also proceedings in the file relating to the Darkhast presented by Talwar Nulla Ramp for phod no. 2 of Survey no. 55 and its sale by public auction. The sale was not confirmed by the Amildar owing to some shortcomings -

BK
24/9/98.

- The particulars as to area &c of S/ no 39 & 53 are as follows

S no	area a. g.	assessment Rs - as
39/1	7-10	5 - 8
39/2	7-18	5 - 8
53/1	4-30.	3 - 8
53/2	4-10	3 - 11

In both these cases, the petitioners state that they intended to relinquish Sub no 1

While by a clerical mistake
the Shanbog entered Sub no
2 in the Razinama
Thus Sub no 2 in the 2 cases
have been cultivated while
Sub no 1 have remained
fallow
In the 1st case the assess-
ment is the same for the
two Sub nos I hence
Sot- have not lost
anything; only there has
been a mistake
In the 2nd Case Sub no 2
is assessed 3 R while Sub no 1
is assessed Rs 3-8. If,
as is presumed, Lingappa
has been paying Rs 3½ (for Sub no 1)
& has been cultivating
Sub no 2 assessed Rs 3, Sot.
has not sustained any loss
The Shanbog has been
greatly to blame in these
cases & has been properly fined

It is however a question if
the entire number has not been
cultivated all these years since this
relinquishment

28

Sub

(1) 2 Rs stamp affixed by pet

(2) The petitioner made appeal against by dated 4-2-98 in time

MG
26/5/98.

(3) Appeal against D comm order turning the pet for unauthorized cultivation of a portion of S no 39 assigned by him

(4) Not a criminal Case

Pet sets up a plea of mistake which has been disbelieved by the D comm. The order seems to show that the Shanbog & the pet have been in collusion

Pet no 2836 is similar to this

Sub & Rev Councillor
Eastern Dn
MG 8/6/98

Call for records & report on the points in the appeal petn

MG 18/6/98

MG 14/6/98
Drafted
15/6/98

Petition 189 8
File No. No. 1283
Serial No.

Name of Petitioner Hucharya s/o Hanmappa

Village Yalladahalli

Taluk Tumkur

District Tumkur

Date of A 19-5-98

Date of Receipt 23-5-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure —1—

ABSTRACT

This is an appeal against order no 320 of 6-4-98 of the D.C. of the Tumkur District fining the petitioner Rs 80 for unauthorized cultivation of a portion of S no 39 of the above village

The order appealed against is as follows—
that double the amount of seven years kandayam from the year Khata should be recovered from the Khatedar for cultivating the 2nd part

of S no 39 & that the second part should be confirmed to Huchappa That the 1st part of the S number should be entered in the accounts as waste since Vilambe year having taken Rajeemana from him That in these two cases the Shanbhogue's carelessness is quite evident That it seems to be the practice of the Shanbhogue to write accounts without seeing the lands during the Pahanee & to write Rajeemanes without enquiring the number to be assigned That to warn others (from usual practice) this Shanbhogue is fined Rs 15. That the Shanbhogue should be intimated to the effect that he would be removed from his office for his future similar conduct

The petitioner states as follows — That ten years back he obtained the S. no 39 by submitting a Darkhast That four years back he desired that the cultivable portion of the said land should be separated from the uncultivable That by the order of the Amildar

the Shanbhogue separated the cultivable land from the ~~S~~ number & gave it to the petitioner for cultivation that for the last two years the petitioner has been enjoying the ~~land~~ ~~[illegible]~~ same that during the jamabandi of this year the Shekdar represented the culti- ~~[illegible]~~ vable land as waste & the waste as cultivable & the land Nos entered in the Tabar Table that the jamabandi officer fined the petitioner Rs 80 This order the petitioner states is ~~[illegible]~~ unjust on the following grounds

1 That the petitioner requested the Amildar for the separation of the waste from the cultivable but not for the possession of the cultivable That at the mistake lies in the accounts of the Shanbhog

2 ~~That the Shanbhogue [illegible] deposed~~
2 That by the deposition of the Shanbhogue it is clear that the mistake was his

3 That the Dy Collr was not right in not considering this

4 That he did not

practice any fraud I
was cultivating the land
shown by the Shanbhogue.
On these grounds he
prays that the order of
the Dy Comr may be
~~cancelled~~ cancelled & ~~he may~~
~~not be~~ this fine may
not be enforced

MRG
25/5/28

4

ಸ್ವೀಕೃತ ದಿನಾಂಕ
14-5-98
ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು

ಸ್ವೀಕೃತ ದಿನಾಂಕ
14-5-98
ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು

Two useless Stamp affixed
only

2835

MYSORE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
PERMANENT
REGD No: 2836
DATE 23-5-98

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ರವರಿಗೆ ಮನವಿ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ನಾನು ಕೃಷಿಕನಾಗಿದ್ದು ಕೃಷಿಯನ್ನೇ ನಂಬಿ ಜೀವನ ಸಾಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಜಮೀನು ಹೊಸಹೊಳಲು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. ... ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪುರಾತನ ಕಾಲದ ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಂಬಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಚಪ್ಪಡಿಗಳು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಂಬಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಚಪ್ಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರಿಸಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ನೀಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

ಸಹಿ/-

ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆಹಳ್ಳಿ
14-5-98

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಕಸ ಗುಡಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಚ್ಛಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಾಲಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಹೂವಿನ ಕುಂಡಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀರು ಹಾಕಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಒಳಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವರು. ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಹೂವಿನ ಕುಂಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವು ಬಗೆಯ ಹೂವಿನ ಗಿಡಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸದಾ ಹೂವಿನ ಸುವಾಸನೆ ಬೀರುತ್ತಿರುವುದ

ಅಚ್ಚಳಿಯದಿರಲಿ

[illegible]

29

Sub

(1) 2 Rs Stamps affd Stamp

(2) No Memo under appellate
application of 4th April 98
in time

Section
File No
Serial No. 2

No. 2 of 98

Name of Petitioner Linganna son of late Linganna Peishwa of Yalaburga

Village Yalaburga

Taluk Gangavathi

District Raichur

Date of Arzi 19-5-98

Date of Receipt 23-5-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

Khatedar against the order of the Asst Commr Raichur Dist dated 6-4-98 passed on the Gangavathi list of the year Regarding the Survey No. 55 of Yalaburga village the order is as follows

Khatedar Linganna is present He is illiterate man. Hence his Natural Khod his possession for Khod No. 2 of Survey No. 55 is meant for Khod No. 1 of the said No is not worthy of belief. His cultivation and Enjoyment of Khod No. 2 since the year Immemorial should be construed as unauthorised cultivation. Hence the

(3) appeal against D Commr's order
forcing the pet[r] for unauthorized
cultivation of a portion of Sno 55
assigned by him

(4) Not a common case

The pet[r] pleads that the unauthorized
cultivation is the result of a mistake
The D Commr has disbelieved the
plea. It is difficult to decide on
any of the other method of calling
for the proceedings Pet[r] No 2835
is similar to this Sub[d] by Rev Commr
Eastern Dn

8/6/98

Call for records &
report on the points
specified in pcn

13/6/98

15/6/98

no 15/6/98

16/6/98

three years
amount of the Kandayam for Ramaiah
Durmukhi and Veerlakshmi should be
recovered from them

No. 11

On the whole recover from Kuppaya Rs.
18/- as fine - confirm plead no. 2 of survey
no. 55 in his khata - set-aside proceedings
for plead ~~2~~ no. 1 and order it as waste
from Survey Khambi.

The petitioner says

He applied and obtained Survey No. 55 for
cultivation about 3 years ago - as the major
portion of the No. was kharab he ~~petitioned~~
applied to the Talati that it might be plotted
and that the portion fit for cultivation might
be confirmed them. Whereupon steps
were taken to sub-divide the No. and the portion
fit for cultivation was placed in his possession
He has been enjoying it accordingly.

During the Jamabandi of the current year
the Shekdar reported that the portion in the
enjoyment of the petitioner had been resumed
by him and that it was seen from the ac-
counts that the portion resumed had been
under cultivation - On this the Amildar
reported this matter to the Zakhar Zalla -
Thereupon the Dy. Collr. as Jamabandi
officer passed the order appealed against -

The petitioner has not been enjoying plead
no. 1 with any intention of fraud or causing
loss to Govt. Without any fraudulent
motive he has been enjoying that portion
shown by the Authority that plead ~~the~~
was fit for cultivation - The views of the

no 2.

11 D

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Dy. Comr. questioning his intention is unjust.

~~His proved bona fides on local investigation and from the Evidence adduced that the petitioner erred~~

It is unjust that the Dy. Comr. has not considered whether the local investigation and the Evidence adduced have disclosed him to be fraudulent

He, an innocent man has been rendered liable for the clerical mistake done by the Shanbhog through (inadvertance) ~~to 8-20-08 to 8-10-08~~ ~~This~~ in the course of the business (5-6-08 to 29-9-08) This is unjust.

The petitioner with a view to reclaim the portion fit for cultivation obtained the land in a regular course and without any fraudulent motive. Accordingly he has been enjoying the portion. But it was not his intention to reclaim the portion unfit for cultivation.

It is clearly proved both in the local investigation and from the Evidence that he is innocent and honest.

Moreover it is proved that the Shanbhog's mistake is a clerical mistake.

The Dy. Comr. without taking the above facts into consideration has ordered to recover from him, an innocent man, twice the amount of Kandaya

This order is opposed to the records
Evidence and Law.

It is urged that the Dy. Comm. has
not taken into consideration the fact
that the petitioner has been paying Lessor
Amount of Kandayam although the
portion of land in his enjoyment bears
a small amount of Kandayam

It is proved from the Chairman's
deposition that this is Rs 60=00 - usual.

Prays that an Equitable order may
be passed by Cancelling the Dy. Comm's
order and that orders may be issued
not to recover the fine from him
pending disposal this appeal

DK
25/5/98

2836

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ. ಅ

ಸೂಚನೆ: ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ. ಆಯ್ಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ.

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯುವಾಗ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಯದೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಯದೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಯದೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

1. ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಆ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಇ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಈ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಉ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಊ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಋ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಎ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಏ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಐ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಒ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಓ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಔ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಅಂ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಅಃ) ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಉತ್ತರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಭೇದ

ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು - ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು.

೪- ಅನೇಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಧಕಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಂತಿಮವಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಮ್ಮತಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಮೂಡಿಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

೫- ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಮೀಸಲಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಮ್ಮತಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಮೂಡಿಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

೬- ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಲಾನುಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

೭- ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಲಾನುಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

೮- ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಲಾನುಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

೯- ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಲಾನುಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Pet 1488 of 1898

Section

File No 1277

Serial No 3277

16/6/98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 2855 dated 6-9-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Huchappa son of Nanjappa of Yalladahalli village in the Tumkur taluk appealing against the order passed by Rao Saheb Pandit for unauthorised cultivation of a portion of S. No. 39 assigned by him is forwarded, together with its one enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

Rec'd C.O. 13-6-98

By order

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,

16/6/1898

15/6/98

Section
File No
Serial No

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

PETITION DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM:

The accompanying Appeal Petition

No 2836 dated 19-6-98

received at the Dewan's Office from

[illegible]

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of [illegible] District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

Recd 13.6.98

By order

BANGALORE

Secretary.

16/6/1898

16/6/98

9125-900 GL
9-98 (38 Rev)





Recd (cds)

18/9/98

Venkanna Rao Ltr
3.9.98
C E Kanna Rao
19.9.98
Received 5 P.M.
in D Records Cpr

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore, Gen
" " Revenue Depts. —

Dated 18th August 1898
Despatched 27th August 1898
Received

Enclosures No. 1 Verified

Precis put up Vide p/.
Tumkur Rpt 212 of 8-9-98
AK
24/9/98

General No. 152
No.

His Official Memo No.
1488 Ret dated the 16th June 1898

Reporting on the petition of Huchappa of Yelladahalli in Village Tiptur Taluk

Subd with the subsequent letter No 212 dy 8th Sept 98 reporting on the petn of Lingappa.

MB
26/9/98

Subd by 1st Commr
with Precis
4/10/98

Petition
29/8

Rd on 1-9-98.
Rept. put up
AK
3-9-98

Subd
MB
5/9/98

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—6-3-97.—10,002.

No. 152
Rev: Ver: file

Deputy Commr's Office,
Tinnevelly District
Dated 18th August 1898.

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
General & Rev: Departments.

Sir

With reference to your official memo No. 6et/1488 dated the 16th June 1898, forwarding for report, a petition from Hucheppa of Yelladahalli village, Tinnevelly Taluk, appealing against my order, fining the petitioner for unauthorized cultivation of a portion of Survey No 39 resigned by him I have the honor to state as follows: —

2. Survey No 39 measures A—G 14-28 assessed at Rupees 11-4-0. The whole No was in the enjoyment of the petitioner until 1890-91, when he got it divided into two —

sub

2/a

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE 20

Sub numbers I and II He
relinquished Sub No II measuring
A 9
7-18 and retained Sub No I
measuring A 9
7-10 Bitumuttadi
of Cultivating Sub No I he Culti
-vated & Sub No II and allowed
Sub No I to remain fallow —
His explanation that it was his
intention to relinquish Sub No I
but that the wrong No was entered
by the Shanbogue in the Razinama
was not considered satisfactory
and he was accordingly fined
Rs 10/-
3 The Shanbogue too has been
punished for his carelessness in
preparing Razinama making question
4. The Vernacular papers connected
with the Case are herewith
returned —

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

M Ramanna Rao
Deputy Commissioner

General Serial No. 30.

Section

File No. TYSORE 1898-99

From The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore, Genl
Revenue Depte

Dated 8th
Despatched 10th } September/98
Received

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 212
No.

Has official memo
No Cet 1487 dated the
16th June 1898
—"—
Reporting on the
petition of Lingappa
of Yelladahalli in
village Tumkur taluk

Subd
Mdy
17 9 98 Have I not sent the record in the case refd to for perusal

Ag 22/9/98

Subd I The records in the case refd to are being perused.
Mdy
23/9/98 Shd be sent with the papers

Ag 23/9/98

Shd b/ 1st Council with the papers

Ag 4/10/98

Petition

Read 14/9.

Memo No: 1487 of 16.6-98 with Petn is put up
Letter No 152 of 18.8-98 from Dy Commr Tumkur (yr No: 1550/92) with ref= was sent to the Asstt Secy

AK 16/9/98 on 5/9/98

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—6-3-97.—10,002.

No. 212
Enc

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District
Tumkur 8th September 1898.

To.

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore, General and Revenue, in Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your official memo No: Petition 1487 dated the 16th June 1898, forwarding for report a petition* from Lingappa of Yeladahalli village, Tumkur Taluk, appealing against my order, fining the petitioner for unauthorized cultivation of a portion of Survey No: 55 assigned by him, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The whole of the Survey number 55 was in the enjoyment of the petitioner until 1895-96, when he got it divided into two subnumbers I and II. He relinquished sub Number II and retained Sub number I. But instead of cultivating Sub number I, he cultivated Sub number II. He is literate and knows to read and write. His explanation that it was his intention to relinquish Sub Number I, but that the wrong number was entered by the

*Petition with its enclosure is herewith resubmitted.

Shanbogue in the Razinamah was not considered satisfactory and he was accordingly fined.

3. The Shanbogue too has been punished for his carelessness in preparing the ex Razinamah in question.

4. The vernacular papers connected with the case have already been submitted along with my letter No: 152 dated 18th August 1898, reporting on a case exactly similar to the one under reference and pertaining to the same village.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

M Narain Rao
Deputy Commissioner

Section
File No
Serial No

23
Three Drafts (Mrs Eng-d 2 Kan)

C.F. 1-97

Proceedings of the Court of Enquiry

Read

Petitions nos 2835 and 2836 dated 19-8-98, of Huchappa and Lingappa of Yaladahalli village in the Sunkur Taluk, appealing against the order of the Dy Comr, Sunkur Dt fining them for unauthorised cultivation of Sy nos 39/2 and 55/2 of the above village, respectively relinquished by them.

2. Letters nos 152 and 212 dated 18-8-98 and 8-9-98 respectively, from the Deputy Comr, Sunkur Dt reporting on the above petns that the petrs pleaded that they intended to relinquish Sy nos 39/1 & 53/1 while the Shanbog entered the wrong numbers in the Mazanama & that he did not accept the plea as satisfactory

3. The records of the case.

Sy nos 39 and 55 of Yaladahalli village in Sunkur Tk were in the enjoyment of the petrs respectively for years

years 1890-91 (Exhibit A of Sch. 39) and 1895-96 (Sch. 55). On the request of the petitioner REFERENCE that the said Nos with the intention of resigning the portion they did not wish each of the sixteen were ~~first~~ divided into 2 Sub-Nos I, II. and relinquishment of Sub-No II of each S. No was accepted. But the petn brought under cultivation the Sub-Nos resigned by them leaving the Sub-Nos I of each S. Nos, fallow. The Dy Collr fined the petn accordingly and hence this appeal by both. The petn alleges that they intended to resign only that No I of each S. No and that the Shanbhag ~~wrongly~~ entered in the registry that Sub No II instead of Sub No I. The Dy Collr reports that the Shanbhag properly was punished for his mistake

Order Hence

Order Memo No. 2876 P.346 & 10/10/98.

There was no dis-honest intention on the part of the petitioners to defraud Govt. The Shanbhag was responsible for the mistake and for his carelessness he has been properly punished. If the entire S. Nos were not cultivated, as must be presumed from the proceedings and from the report or finding of the Dy Collr, and only one Sub No was cultivated instead of the other of almost equal extent, the fine levied should be remitted and the petitioners directed to cultivate the portion not resigned.

Secretary.

To the Dy Collr Sunkeri Dh with records.

28-9-98

1-10-98

Section
File No
Serial No



Section
File No
Serial No